

The motion was adopted.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANTOSH BAGRODIA): We shall now take up clause-by-clause consideration of the Bill.

Clause 2 was added to the Bill.

Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.

SHRI I.D. SWAMI: Sir, I move:

That the Bill be passed.

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANTOSH BAGRODIA): Now, we will take up the Cable Television Networks (Regulation) Amendment Bill, 2000.

**THE CABLE TELEVISION NETWORKS (REGULATION)
AMENDMENT BILL, 2000**

**THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF INFORMATION
AND BROADCASTING (SHRI ARUN JAITLEY):** Sir, I move:

"That the Bill further to amend the Cable Television Networks (Regulation) Act, 1995, as passed by Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

Sir, this was an Act intended to regulate the cable network system within India. At the time when this Act was adopted and put into implementation, perhaps, we did not have sufficient experience because, at that time, this industry in India was nascent. Now, for the last five - six years, after seeing the functioning of this Act, there are a few amendments which have been necessitated. Probably, these amendments are in three - four categories. I will just specify each one of them. The main amendment being that, in section 5 and section 6 of the original Act, there was a provision for a broadcasting code and an advertising code, to be provided

for under the provisions of this Act. However, in both the sections, even though the rules provided for the broadcasting code and the advertising code, there was a proviso that this would apply only to channels which are encrypted and those which are free to air would be exempted from the provisions of the Act.

[The Vice-Chairman (Shri Adhik Shirodkar) in the Chair]

So, two categories of channels have been operating--one for which some money has to be paid, which are known as pay channels or encrypted channels, which are telecast with the help of a decoder. The broadcasting code and the advertising code lay down various norms on advertising and broadcasting of programmes. We found that the programmes which were free to air were exempted from the broadcasting code and the advertising code. As a result of which, several complaints used to be received. On several occasions, in this House itself, hon. Members had occasions to point out this anomaly which existed in the Act. Therefore, an amendment has been proposed to section 5 and section 6. The proviso to section 5 and 6 are sought to be deleted now. The broadcasting code and the advertisement code would be applicable to all channels which are carried to our homes by the cable operators.

The second amendment which has been proposed is, to implement this Act, certain officers have to be notified by the Central Government. But since officers were to operate at the level of every district in the country, since cable operation is operated at the very grassroot level in every city and district of the country, there was a difficulty in having officers nominated by the Central Government in each of the areas. Hence, the States were requested to nominate the officers; but several States, in fact, found it difficult even to nominate the officers. Therefore, amendments are proposed so that the Act itself would prescribe who the officers would be. The District Magistrate of every district, the Sub-Divisional Magistrate and the Commissioner of Police of every area would be the authorised officers who would really have to implement the provisions of this Act.

Sir, the third amendment relates to the carrying of channels of Doordarshan. There is a 'must carry' clause, which exists in section 8 of the Act. Section 8 provides that at least two Doordarshan channels would be carried on every cable network. Now, our experience has shown that in a

large number of places, either this was not being done or was done in a manner that the signals were not being well received from the cable operators. Satellite signals and terrestrial signals were mixed with each other. A provision has now been made that every cable operator would telecast at least two terrestrial channels, and one regional language channel too would be shown on the prime band. As you see, Doordarshan, in the last one year, has started a large number of regional language satellite channels in every State language, in almost every regional language. Therefore, there is a 'must carry' clause in this Bill. In fact, the Standing Committee had recommended that the Act be amended so as to see that these provisions are really, adequately, enforced.

Sir, the last amendment is to section 20, which is now sought to be substituted. Section 19 originally dealt with prohibition on individual programmes. Certain conditions were prescribed. Section 20 has a larger prohibition; the Central Government has the power to provide a prohibition with regard to certain cable networks. We have, therefore, provided certain categories where there are programmes which are detrimental to the public interest, on several considerations; and, there is a power which is given in section 20, saying that those networks can be prohibited, after a hearing being given to them. The conditions under which they can be prohibited are the same which are there in article 19(2). They have been verbally lifted from there. Whatever are the Constitutionally-prescribed limitations on freedom of expression, which the Constitution has laid down in article 19(2), have been put in section 20 of this Bill.

These are the four categories of amendments which we have proposed to this Act. I, therefore, propose that this hon. House take this Bill into consideration and pass this amendment to the 1995 Act.

Thank you.

The question was proposed.

श्री सुरेश पचौरी (मध्य प्रदेश) : माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, केबल टेलीविज़न नेटवर्क रेगुलेशन अमेंडमेंट बिल-2000 जो अभी मंत्री जी ने प्रस्तुत किया है, दरअसल यह अधिनियम 1995 का संशोधित रूप है जिसमें अनुभव के आधार पर और समय समय पर जो चिंता जाहिर की गयी, उसको दृष्टिगत रखते हुए चार महत्वपूर्ण संशोधन सुझाए गये हैं। खास तौर से इस बिल के सैक्शन-5 और सैक्शन-6 में प्रोग्राम कोड और ऐडवर्टाइज़िंग कोड का प्रावधान रखा गया है और आगे माननीय मंत्री जी ने बताया कि कुछ जो शर्तें रखी गयी हैं, उसमें उन्होंने इस

बात का भी उल्लेख किया है कि जो प्रोग्राम फ्री हैं, उन पर यह लागू नहीं होगा। पिछले कई दिनों से यह बात आ रही थी कि फॉरेन सैटलाइट चैनल पर जो कार्यक्रम दिखाए जाते हैं, वे किसी न किसी रूप में आपत्तिजनक होते हैं और फॉरेन सैटलाइट चैनल पर सैक्शन-5 और सैक्शन-6 ऐप्लीकेबल नहीं हो पाते हैं। उसका परिणाम यह होता है कि फॉरेन सैटलाइट चैनल से कई प्रोग्राम्स अपलिक कर लिये जाते हैं। अब यह व्यवस्था की गयी है कि हमारा प्रोग्राम कोड होगा, हमारा ऐडवर्टाइजिंग और ब्रॉडकास्टिंग कोड होगा जो हर किस्म के चैनल पर असरदायक होगा और कहीं न कहीं किसी न किसी रूप में हमारा इस पर अंकुश होगा - चाहे वे पे चैनल्स हों, चाहे वे एयर चैनल पर ही फ्री क्यों न हों। मैं सोचता हूँ कि यह एक ऐसा कदम है जो समय रहते सही कदम उठाया जा रहा है क्योंकि पिछले कुछ समय से इस सदन में इस बात पर चिंता जाहिर की जाती थी कि फॉरेन सैटलाइट चैनल से जो कार्यक्रम दिखाए जाते हैं, उन पर किसी न किसी प्रकार का नियंत्रण होना चाहिए - चाहे वे एयर चैनल से फ्री दिखाए जा रहे हों, चाहे वे पे चैनल्स से ही दिखाए जाने वाले कार्यक्रम क्यों न हों। महोदय, प्रश्न यह उठता है कि यह जो बिल लाया जा रहा है, इसमें जो ऑथोराइज्ड ऑफिसर का प्रोवीजन रखा गया है, उसका इम्प्लीमेंटेशन जिला स्तर पर होना था और इसलिए यह व्यवस्था की गयी है कि अब जिला स्तर के अधिकारी इसका इम्प्लीमेंटेशन करेंगे - चाहे वे सब डिविजनल मजिस्ट्रेट हों, चाहे वे कमिश्नर रैंक के अधिकारी हों। सैक्शन-आठ में जो हेजी पिक्चर्स दिखाए जाते हैं, या दिखाए जाने की जो शिकायत है, उन्हें दूर करने के लिए कदम उठाने की बात की गयी है और साथ ही इसी सैक्शन में केबल ऑपरेटर्स को दो चैनल और एक रीजनल चैनल दिये जाने का प्रावधान रखा गया है। रीजनल चैनल दिये जाने का जो काम है, मैं समझता हूँ कि वह एक अच्छा काम है, स्वागत्य है क्योंकि रीजनल प्रोग्राम्स में लोगों का रुझान बढ़ रहा है। जब हम रीजनल लैंग्वेज में, रीजनल सिस्टम में रीजनल कल्चर की जानकारी लोगों को देते हैं तो लोग जल्दी से उस चीज़ को आत्मसात करते हैं। जब हम कहते हैं कि हमारे देश में राजभाषा का प्रयोग होना चाहिए तो उसका मकसद यह नहीं होता कि हम अपने देश से अंग्रेजी को भगाना चाहते हैं बल्कि उसके पीछे अभिप्राय यह रहता है कि लोग कम समय में ज्यादा आसानी से बात को आत्मसात कैसे कर सकते हैं। उसके पीछे यह भावना रहती है। ठीक इसी भावना को दृष्टिगत रखते हुए जो रीजनल प्रोग्राम्स को बढ़ावा देने के लिए सैक्शन-8 में प्रोवीजन किया गया है, मैं सोचता हूँ कि वह एक अच्छा कदम है। साथ ही सैक्शन-20 में जो इन्डीविजुअल प्रोग्राम्स के लिए शर्तें रखी गयी हैं, जो संशोधन सुझाए गये हैं, वह भी एक अच्छा कदम है क्योंकि कई बार यह बात आती थी कि जो वलार चैनल्स दिखाए जा रहे हैं, ऐसे प्रोग्राम्स हैं जो बहुत आपत्तिजनक हैं, वे अलग अलग चैनल्स से दिखाए जाते हैं, उन पर अंकुश लगाने के लिए या उन पर नियंत्रण करने के लिए क्या व्यवस्था है? इसमें और जो आपने सैक्शन 20 में कुछ प्रावधान रखे हैं, मैं सोचता हूँ कि वे काफी अच्छे प्रावधान हैं। खास तौर से सैक्शन 20 के सब-सैक्शन 2 में जिसमें यह लिखा है कि

"(2) Where the Central Government thinks it necessary or expedient so to do in the interest of the -
sovereignty or integrity of India; or
security of India; or
friendly relations of India with any foreign State; or
public order, decency or morality,"

मान्यवर, मैं बड़े अदब के साथ कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारा अपना अनुभव यह रहा है कि हमारे देश में साम्प्रदायिक सद्भाव बनाए रखने के लिए या इंडियन कल्चर की जानकारी देने के लिए या साम्प्रदायिकता से निपटने के लिए जब कुछ फिल्में बनाई गईं चाहे वह "फायर" हो या "वाटर" हो, तब हमारा अनुभव यह रहा कि उन्हें रोकने की कोशिश की गई। "वाटर" के साथ तो स्थिति यह हुई कि केन्द्र सरकार ने दो बार उसे क्लीयरेंस दे दी लेकिन फिर भी उसको रोकने की कोशिश इस रूप में की गई कि उसकी जितनी निंदा की जाए, कम है। मैं यह बात इसलिए नहीं कह रहा हूँ कि इन दोनों फिल्मों से उस अभिनेत्री का सरोकार रहा है जो संयोग से हमारे इस सदन की भी माननीय सदस्या हैं बल्कि मैं यह कह रहा हूँ कि एक तरफ तो हम सेक्शन 20 के सब-सेक्शन 2 में इस प्रकार का प्रावधान रखते हैं लेकिन यह बड़ी विडम्बना वाली बात है कि हम दूसरी तरफ ऐसी फिल्मों को न बनने देते हैं, न उनकी शूटिंग होने के लिए कोई उपयुक्त वातावरण का निर्माण करते हैं।

महोदय, जहां तक ऐडवर्टाइजिंग कोड का प्रोविज़न जो सेक्शन 5 और 6 में किया है, उस सिलसिले में भी मेरा यह कहना है कि हमारा अनुभव यह रहा है, क्योंकि मंत्री जी ने यह कहा कि 1995 के ऐक्ट के बाद हमारे जो अनुभव रहे, उस आधार पर हम यह अमेंडेड बिल सन् 2000 में ला रहे हैं, तो जब ऐडवर्टाइजिंग कोड की बात हो रही है तो किस प्रकार के ऐडवर्टाइजमेंट आ रहे हैं, हम इस बारे में भी विचार करें। न केवल ऐडवर्टाइजमेंट तम्बाकू के बारे में आते हैं, न केवल ऐडवर्टाइजमेंट लिक्कर्स के बारे में आते हैं बल्कि मैं बड़े अदब के साथ कहना चाहता हूँ कि महिलाओं की आड़ में इस प्रकार के ऐडवर्टाइजमेंट भी आते हैं जिनकी जितनी निंदा की जाए, कम है। हमारा भारत देश, हमारी भारतीय संस्कृति और हमारी जो भारतीय परंपरा है, वह अत्यंत अनुपम है जिसका अनुकरण दूसरे देशों के लोग करना चाहते हैं लेकिन वही ऐडवर्टाइजमेंट के नाम पर जब इस प्रकार का नग्न प्रदर्शन किया जाता है तो उस पर भी इस प्रकार के कोड की जब बात हो तो विचार किया जाना बहुत जरूरी है।

महोदय, फैशन शो भी बहुत दिखाया जाता है और फैशन शो की आड़ में क्या-क्या दिखाया जाता है, हमारे जो ऊर्जावान मंत्री हैं, मुझे विश्वास है कि जब वे अपने कार्यकाल में ऐसी पहल कर रहे हैं कि कई चीजों में अनुभव के आधार पर सुधार लाए जाने की आवश्यकता है तो फैशन शो में भी किस प्रकार का नियंत्रण और अंकुश हो, इस बारे में भी वे विचार करेंगे। जब मॉडल कोड की बात हो और ऐडवर्टाइजमेंट कोड की बात हो और ऐसे कार्यक्रम जिन कार्यक्रमों के प्रदर्शन से वॉयलेशन होता है तो निश्चित रूप से उस बारे में विचार करना चाहिए।

महोदय, मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करने से पहले दो-तीन बातें और कहना चाहता हूँ। एक तरफ तो यह व्यवस्था की गई है कि सेक्शन 20 के सब-सेक्शन 2 में इस प्रकार के कार्यक्रम आयोजित किए जाएं जिनसे साम्प्रदायिक सद्भावना बढ़े, सहिष्णुता बढ़े, एक अच्छा वातावरण तैयार हो वहीं दूसरी तरफ लोगों को यह अपेक्षा भी है, जब आपने दूरदर्शन में दो चैनल देने का प्रावधान किया है कि कंपीटीशन जो प्राइवेट चैनल्स से हो रहा है, उसमें वे खरे उतरें वहीं दूरदर्शन से लोगों को यह अपेक्षा भी होती है...मैं कोई किसी पर ब्यंग्य नहीं कर रहा हूँ कि वह दूरदर्शन "अटल दर्शन" होकर न रह जाए बल्कि उस दूरदर्शन में सही रूप में निष्पक्ष रूप से सारी चीजें

दिखाई जाए - इस प्रकार की व्यवस्था हो तो लोगों की दूरदर्शन में आस्था बढ़ेगी।

जहां तक केबल ऑपरेटर्स का प्रश्न है, प्राइवेट टीवी चैनल्स वालों का प्रश्न है, यह सुनिश्चित करना जरूरी है कि केबल ऑपरेटर्स बनने की आड़ में लोग अपना व्यवसाय न चलाएं। इसको ब्लैकमेल करने की प्रैक्टिस एडॉप्ट न करें। इसलिए किसी न किसी रूप में केन्द्रीय सरकार का नियंत्रण होना आवश्यक है। सैक्शन-20 में केन्द्रीय सरकार को शक्ति प्रदान करने का जो प्रावधान रखा गया है, मैं समझता हूं कि यह एक अच्छा कदम है। कदम तो अच्छा है लेकिन सवाल इस बात का है कि नीयत अच्छी हो तभी हम यह मानेंगे कि जो नीति निर्धारित की गई है, यदि वह सही नीयत से किया जा रहा है तो निश्चितरूप से उसके अच्छे परिणाम होंगे। इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ मैं केबल टेलीविजन नेटवर्क (रेजूलेशन) अमेंडमेंट बिल, 2000 का समर्थन करता हूं।

SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD (Bihar): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am extremely grateful that you have given me an opportunity to speak on this Bill. I wholeheartedly support this Bill. The cable revolution is a part of our daily life today. We cannot wish it away. Operators have got the right to show; people have got the right to see. But, obviously, it is not unlimited. That is why in the year 1955, a regulatory mechanism was introduced there. It was a welcome development. With the passage of time, certain missing links were felt, and it is very heartening to note that those missing links are sought to be filled up by today's amendment. Of particular relevance is the amendment to sections 5 and 6 of the parent Act. There are two provisos -- in section 5, if a foreign TV channel did not confirm to the programme code, there was no control; similarly, in section 6, if the advertisement that is telecast by the foreign channels did not confirm to the advertisement code, there was an exemption; there was no need for that. We have civilizational norms. There has been a consensus in the country about certain behavioural norms by which we seek to undertake our social intercourse. And if the foreign channels are not susceptible to those feelings of this country, the exemption that was available to them under sections 5 and 6 has to go. My dear colleague, Shri Pachouri, mentioned about certain channels. I don't want to name any particular channel. But I would certainly request the hon. Minister to do something in regard to the reckless manner in which some of the presentations are being made by many of the foreign channels, in complete disregard of the social norms of this country. Certainly, creative freedom ought to be recognised. Certainly, creativity ought to be given due respect. But there is also an equally important element of the susceptibility of the society in which it is sought to be presented. We need not always go by the rigid modalities of this

discussion, but certainly if there is a consensus that a particular advertisement or a programme is transcending that norm, the law will have to intervene. Sir, I have an example of a particular advertisement where a television company sought to highlight a particular episode of Mahabharata in the most shameless manner in order to sell its television. Certainly, it is blasphemy in the extreme. I am happy to learn that a protest was made, and now a control has been brought. Therefore, the renewal of the exemption in sections 5 and 6, which was available to the foreign satellite channels, is a very welcome development.

Sir, as far as the amendment to section 8 is concerned, making it obligatory upon the cable operators to show two terrestrial channel programmes and a local language programme, is equally welcome. Since there is a cable revolution today, the people of the country in a particular State have got the right to view the local language programmes also on their cable television; otherwise the excessive commercial tinge in these cable programmes is certainly not a very healthy development, in the interest of the people, particularly children, which we have seen over the years. Therefore, I feel it is a very welcome development, as far as the amendment to section 8 is concerned, because it has now been made obligatory, while in the parent Act, they had a right to choose that. Equally welcome, Sir, is the amendment to section 11, because initially the bar was, if it was not registered, it could be confiscated. Now if it is in violation of sections 5, 6, 7 and 8, even then the power of seizure has been given.

Lastly, I would like to make few observations about the amendment to section 20. Sir, this was long felt. Sir, I can quote from legal experience that what section 20 incorporates in an amendment form is nothing but many of the regulations which are there in the Fundamental Rights chapter itself. Therefore, whether it is the sovereignty and integrity of India; or security of India; or friendly relations of India with foreign state; or public order, decency or morality, Sir, I think, these points mentioned in sub-section (iv) were in the mind of Shri Suresh Pachouri when he mentioned about some of the films. Sir, we have great regard for the creative genius of any particular actor or actress. We welcome them and we appreciate them. But we would also like to emphasise very gently and very respectfully that people also have got a right to be appreciated about their sentiments. A mean, a balance has to be struck, and I think there is also a general consensus in the country. If this balance is kept in mind, I am sure the real

focus of this amendment will be appreciated and supported wholeheartedly, in the right spirit. I am thankful to you, and I support this Bill wholeheartedly.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ADHIK SHIRODKAR): Now, Prof. Bharati Ray. You have three minutes, Madam.

PROF. (SMT.) BHARATI RAY (West Bengal): How many minutes, Sir?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ADHIK SHIRODKAR): For you they are not less. *(Interruptions)* Because you are very articulate.

PROF. (SMT.) BHARATI RAY : Sir, I will come straight to the point. I would like to put forward three points. Firstly, I wonder whether, in this age of internet and globalisation, when the well-to-do and the rich are having powerful antennas, it is at all possible to regulate or control either any showing or viewing of programmes. Frankly, in my humble view, we are fighting a losing battle. Nonetheless, we must try to regulate the foreign invasion by foreign uplinking. If we must try, then, why should we bring in such a piecemeal legislation? In these days of convergence, Sir, telecom, computerization and broadcasting, they are all integrally inter-linked. We are in the era of convergence law. So, a Bill, more comprehensive in nature, with wider dimensions, would have been welcome; not a mere amendment of the cable law only. That is the first point.

Secondly, the cable operators have been asked to carry programmes of three of your DD channels. Who will decide what programmes should be carried? I am very sorry to say that most of the viewers switch off as soon as the DD programmes are shown. They are very insipid and uninspiring and the transmission is also bad. When you ask the cable operators to show our channels, we must see to it that they are good, they are inspiring, they give a message to the people, and the transmission is also good. Does the DD itself conform to the programme and advertisement codes? I know, public order, morality and all these are taken from the Constitution itself. But I would like to say that ethics should also be observed. For example, as you know, Sir, children are being used in advertisements these days. In the nucleus households, children occupy a very important position. It is not like the joint family system of earlier days. In the nucleus

households, children occupy a decision making position. Therefore, we see advertisements using children.

So, we are in the process of creating consumer-goods-hungry people from childhood itself. Well, it is not immoral; it is not indecent. But should we encourage this? I know that violence is a reality. But must we feed the entire country with violence? It is neither immoral nor indecent, but it is dangerous. Showing of semi-religious programmes or advertisements is also dangerous. In the principle Act, there is a prohibition against hurting the religious sentiments. But there is nothing against fundamentalism or fostering of superstition, in the name of religion. I do think, Sir, that DD should come out with a new programme and a new advertisement code. And the cable operators must adhere to that.

My third point is regarding section 6. The authorised officers have been empowered too much. They can interfere with privacy. They can even indulge in cultural policing. Sir, if I remember correctly, it is mentioned in section 18 of the principle Act that they are the ones to decide about the programmes to be transmitted or not to be transmitted.

As per Section 18, they are the ones whose written complaints, the Court is going to take cognizance of. What about the knowledgeable people? What about the recognised organisations? Are they less important than the so-called authorised people? This amendment does not try to amend that section. Finally, Sir, there is no provision of punishment in the Bill. Section 2 of the principal Act defines cable operator as one who provides cable services or otherwise controls or is responsible for the management of a T.V. network. We know that unemployed graduates and engineers work there for a little bit of money. But the important people are those who manage and control the T.V. network and they are very powerful people. What steps do we take to punish them? The hon. Minister has himself stated that Sections 5 and 6 of the principal Act provide that they have to follow our advertisement codes. Have they followed it? What have you done against them? Laws without the means of enforcement are lame and ineffective. I am afraid that this Bill will not fully serve our purpose. The "Authorised" officers will perhaps seize all the equipment from poor cable operators and stop the transmission of some programmes which they think objectionable or which they disapprove of, while the powerful cable mafia will continue to happily get permission of showing programmes on

violence, sex, fundamentalism and get away unscathed. Thank you, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ADHIK SHIRODKAR) : I am confident that the Minister will tread cautiously in view of the danger signals spelt out by you. Shri Ramachandra Khuntia - you have got one minute.

SHRI RAMACHANDRA KHUNTIA (Orrisa) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the Cable Television Networks (Regulation) Amendment Bill, 2000 was the necessity of time. As the hon. Minister has very clearly stated, this Bill was enacted in 1995; after the Government experienced various incidents in cable network, it has brought this amendment to regulate and monitor the cable working. Sir, while appreciating the thought of the Government to bring this amendment, I also feel that amendments bearing Nos. 5, 6, 8, 19 and 20 are very much necessary. Sir, as far as section 19 of the principal Act is concerned, I request that for the portion beginning with the words, "Officer not below the rank of ..." and ending with the words, "...by the State Government in this behalf", the words, "by any authorised officer" shall be substituted. The hon. Minister in his explanation has said that some State Governments did not name the officer. But I would like to know whether the Central Government, in order to capture the total power, has now withdrawn the power which was delegated to the State Government to name the officer. I do not say that the intention of the Government is like that. But the hon. Minister may clarify that point in the course of his reply. Shri Suresh Pachouri has rightly cited the incident of the shooting of the film "Water". Sir, the other points in Section 9 of the amendment Bill, namely, the sovereignty or integrity of India, security of India, friendly relations of India with any foreign State, public order, decency or morality are very good points. But should we not presume that, sometimes, the Government, in order to restrain some cable operators whom it does not like or some other cable operators who do not give more telecast of scenes, sceneries or incidents it wants, that other cable operators do, does not give them the actual right that they should get?

My third point is that the Bill provides that "authorised officer" means, within his local limits of jurisdiction, a District Magistrate or a Sub-divisional Magistrate. I do not understand why, while the Sub-divisional Magistrate is being authorised for the inspection of, or for regulating, this, the District Police Officer, whom you call "S.P.", is not being authorised. "Commissioner of Police" has been mentioned here. As you know, the

designations of police officers differ from State to State. In my State, it may be "Inspector-General" or "Director-General of Police", and somewhere else, it may be "Deputy Commissioner". "Commissioner of Police", in my opinion, is of a much more higher rank. When you are authorising the Sub-Divisional Magistrate and also the District Magistrate, equally, the District Police Superintendent or whoever, maybe, D.C., should also have been authorised for this. This point may also be cleared by the hon. Minister. Other points have been discussed. We do expect that the Minister will clarify these points.

The last point is, we do enact much legislation. We also amend them. But, are they being properly implemented? If they are not being implemented properly, the enactment or the amendment becomes useless. The hon. Minister is very active and dynamic. I do expect from him that, even if it is impossible to regulate and control it now, he will try to do his best to implement the Act. With these words, I support the Bill brought by the hon. Minister.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ADHIK SHIRODKAR): Smt. Kum Kum Rai. Shri V. P. Duraisamy.

SHRIMATI KUM KUM RAI (Bihar): Sir, my name is there.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ADHIK SHIRODKAR): I called your name.

SHRI V. P. DURAISAMY (Tamil Nadu): You can speak after me, Madam.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ADHIK SHIRODKAR) : Let him speak. I will call you, Madam, after him. I called out your name. But, since you were reluctant to get up, I thought that you had changed your mind.

SHRI V. P. DURAISAMY: Sir, thank you very much. On behalf of my party and on my own behalf, I support the Cable Television Networks (Regulation) Amendment Bill.

First, I want to point out that the quality of the Doordarshan programmes should be improved. For the purpose of this, there is nothing

wrong in the Doordarshan people interacting with private TV channels and finding out how they have improved the quality of their programmes, and Doordarshan should adopt the same.

There was the Joshi Committee, which suggested that the Indian television should have Indian personality. We all know that Doordarshan cannot compete with other channels that are having their own advertisement code. For example, Mr. Vice-Chairman, you know Channel V very well.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ADHIK SHIRODKAR): I am ignorant of it...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI V. P. DURAISAMY: We were all shocked to see that university girls were asked to undress themselves and sleep with the bare minimum. I regret to say that the film was shot at a public place in Mumbai. The Mumbai Police has registered a case against the Channel V authorities. I do not know what has happened to that case.

Sir, I want to say a few words about the Fashion TV. They are showing obscene things. If they want to show such things, at least they can show them after ten o'clock or eleven.

Sir, it is corrupting the minds of college students, youngsters and people like us. I request the hon. Vice-Chairman to direct the Hon. Minister to see that this TV telecast should not be there during daytime. It should be done after 10 p.m.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ADHIK SHIRODKAR): Do you mean to say that corruption should start after ten?

SHRI V.P. DURAISAMY: The proposal for a channel devoted to education has not materialised so far. Why is it pending for such a long time? Since Doordarshan has the largest reach, it can embark upon an education programme to eradicate illiteracy in India.

Sir, the Pakistan Television has a wide coverage in areas like Jammu and Kashmir and the North-Eastern States. Why is Doordarshan not able to penetrate in these areas to counter their propaganda? Doordarshan should have a reach in these areas and should counter the

propaganda made by Pakistan Television.

Sir, if I remember correctly, a Broadcasting Bill is already pending before the House. A committee under the Chairmanship of Shri Sharad Pawar was constituted to examine the Bill. The Committee has made a number of recommendations. This House would like to know the fate of those recommendations.

There was another Bill called the Information, Communications and Entertainment Bill. What has happened to that Bill? The Government should bring in a comprehensive Bill encompassing all the suggestions made.

Sir, the programme code and the advertisement code should be suitably amended. I suggest that there should also be a Censor Board to deal with television programmes. We have good laws in the country, but what is important is strengthening the machinery to enforce the laws strictly.

I hope, the hon. Minister would soon come forward with a comprehensive Bill, incorporating all the suggestions and recommendations made by various quarters.

Before I conclude, I would like to say one more thing. FM channel of All India Radio repeatedly relays old songs in all the languages, be it Tamil, Malayalam, Telugu or even Hindi. My suggestion is that some new songs should be added in its programmes.

With these words, I support the Bill.

श्रीमती कुम कुम राय (बिहार) : धन्यवाद, केबल टेलीविजन नेटवर्क अधिनियम 1995 के संशोधन के बिल पर आज हम चर्चा के लिए यहां उपस्थित हुए हैं और उसके उद्देश्यों और कारणों में हमारे मंत्री महोदय ने हमें बताया है - "दर्शकों को अवांछनीय कार्यक्रमों को उपलब्ध कराए जाने से बचाया जा सके और इस प्रोद्योगिकी के अधिक से अधिक अनुकूलन, विदोहन को समर्थ बनाया जा सके।" तो उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपके माध्यम से मंत्री जी से यह पूछना चाहूंगी कि ये अवांछनीय कार्यक्रम यानी वे कार्यक्रम जिसे आपने अवांछनीय कहा है ...(व्यवधान)

श्रीमती सरला माहेश्वरी : ये तो मंत्री जी की हिंदी बोल रही हैं ...(व्यवधान)

श्रीमती कुम कुम राय : नहीं नहीं, यह मेरी हिंदी नहीं है। मैंने इसका पाठ किया है। मैंने इसमें जो लिखा है वे ही दो पंक्तियां पढ़ी हैं और उसी लिखी हुई पंक्ति का एक शब्द 'अवांछनीय'

है।

इसलिए मैं पूछना चाहूंगी कि ये अवांछनीय कार्यक्रम कौन से हैं और वांछनीय कार्यक्रम कौन से हैं? आगे आपने लिखा है कि जो लोग विज्ञापन कोड का पालन नहीं करते उनके खिलाफ आप कार्यवाही भी करेंगे। तो मेरा विनम्र प्रश्न है कि भारत सरकार का क्या कोई विज्ञापन कोड है, यदि है तो वह क्या है? उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं कहना चाहती हूँ कि इस आर्थिक उदारीकरण और राष्ट्रीयकरण की स्थिति में जो दृश्य और श्रव्य मीडिया यानी जो आंखों से देखा जा सकता है और कानों से सुना जा सकता है जिसमें दूरदर्शन और अन्य तमाम जो देशी व विदेशी चैनल भी शामिल हैं, तो टेलीविजन के माध्यम से आज घर-घर में और हरेक स्तर में, हर वर्ग के लोगों के बीच में ये तमाम कार्यक्रम और विज्ञापन पहुंचाए जा रहे हैं और उसे हमारा हर दर्शक वर्ग देख रहा है। अवांछनीय कार्यक्रम के विषय में मैं एक उदाहरण देना चाहूंगी। आजकल ऐसे कार्यक्रम और ऐसे धारावाहिक दिखाए जा रहे हैं जिसमें पिछले कुछ सालों से हम लोगों ने यह महसूस किया है कि जो कार्यक्रम गृहणियों के लिए हैं यानी बारह से तीन बजे तक, दूरदर्शन पर डीडी-1 पर भी और अन्य चैनलों पर भी जो कार्यक्रम दिखाये जाते हैं, अक्सर उनमें अवैध संबंधों का ही महिमा मंडन दिखाया जाता है। यानी हमारी विवाह की जो संस्था है उस पर विश्वास न करते हुए, हमारा जो परिवार है परिवार की उस इकाई को मजबूत न बनाते हुए, किसी तीसरे व्यक्ति से बनाए गए अवैध संबंधों का ही महिमा मंडन किया जाता है। पति-पत्नी के आपसी संबंधों में आई दरार को पाटने के कोई नुस्खे नहीं बताए जाते बल्कि इस प्रकार के अवैध, इलीगल व असामाजिक संबंधों का ही महिमा मंडन होता है। क्या ये वांछनीय कार्यक्रम हैं?

विज्ञापन कोड के संबंध में अनेकों उदाहरण हैं, लेकिन मैं एक उदाहरण देना चाहती हूँ। किसी विदेशी उत्पाद के लिए दिखाये जाते वक्त सिर्फ एक क्लिपिंग दिखाई जाती है उसमें लिखित वार्निंग रहती है, लिखित चेतावनी दी जाती है कि इसको करके नहीं देखा जाए, यह स्पेशल व्यवस्था से किया गया है, लेकिन उसमें दिखाया क्या जाता है कि ऊपर हेलीकॉप्टर से एक व्यक्ति छलांग लगाता है और नीचे से किसी शीतल पेय की बोतल ले कर पहुंच जाता है। इस प्रकार के दृश्य देखे और सुने जाते हैं, लेकिन उसमें लिखी चेतावनी को पढ़ा नहीं जाता। क्योंकि हमारे शिक्षा और साक्षरता की दर काफी चिंताजनक है। हमारे दर्शक उसको पढ़ना नहीं जानते क्योंकि वह चेतावनी हिन्दी में न हो करके इंग्लिश में रहती है। दिखाया जाता है कि हेलीकॉप्टर के ऊपर से एक व्यक्ति छलांग लगाकर नीचे से एक बोतल उठा करके ले गया। इसलिए यह विज्ञापन कोड क्या है? मैं माननीय मंत्री महोदय से जानना चाहती हूँ कि आपने जो अवांछनीय कार्यक्रम और विज्ञापन कोड का उल्लेख किया है, क्या आप एशोयर करेंगे कि हमारे भारतवर्ष में जो हमारी सामाजिक परंपरा है, हमारी जो संस्कृति है और हमारी जो तमाम सामाजिक संस्थाएं हैं, क्या उनको प्रोत्साहन देने के लिए आपने विभिन्न चैनलों को कोई मार्ग-निर्देश जारी करने का विचार किया है? (व्यवधान) साथ ही तमाम चैनल जो तरह-तरह के विज्ञापन दे रहे हैं जिनमें आपत्तिजनक दृश्य होते हैं और जिस प्रकार से औरतों को दिखाया जाता है वह एक प्रकार से उनका शोषण ही होता है, उनके माध्यम से जिन चीजों व उत्पादों को बेचने के लिए लोगों को प्रोत्साहित किया जाता है, इसको बंद करने के लिए क्या आपने कोई मार्ग-दर्शन तैयार किए हैं? तथा साथ ही इन तमाम चैनलों द्वारा इनके कड़ाई से पालन के लिए कोई दिशा-निर्देश जारी करने का भी विचार किया है? यदि इस प्रकार के संशोधन में वह भी शामिल कर लिया होता तो आपका यह संशोधन स्वागत योग्य होता और मैं इसका समर्थन करना चाहूंगी। धन्यवाद।

श्रीमती सरला माहेश्वरी : महिलाओं के साथ थोड़ी रियायत होनी चाहिए । ...*(व्यवधान)*

उपसमाध्यक्ष (श्री अधिक शिरोडकर) : महिलाओं के साथ मैं हमेशा डर कर बात करता हूँ, लेकिन मजबूर हूँ ।.....*(व्यवधान)* Mr. H.K. Javare Gowda. You have got only one minute.

SHRI H.K. JAVARE GOWDA (Karnataka): One minute!

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ADHIK SHRIODKAR) : Yes. Please stick to the time schedule. Otherwise, I do not mind, we will sit up to 7 o'clock. I am warning you. *(Interruptions)*.

SHRI H.K. JAVARE GOWDA : Sir, I welcome this Bill. As the hon. Minister has stated briefly while presenting the Bill, to avoid unreasonable programmes from being made available to the viewers, he has brought this Bill. All my friends have spoken about the Bill. But my apprehension is that, still, we are not able to make laws on par with the development of technology. First of all, when Doordarshan was introduced, the entire nation was of the opinion that it would help us in getting the news as well as the pictures immediately. It was later that it developed into a market area. The marketeers and the advertisers took the full share, 90 per cent share, to promote their business. What is the method they have adopted to promote their business? Undesirable methods. Whatever may be the manner, they want to get their products sold, their things to be advertised. That is the sole objective.

SHRI SATISH PRADHAN (Maharashtra): They are hijacking it.

SHRI H.K. JAVARE GOWDA: Yes. Another important thing is this. Whether it is relevant or irrelevant, I do not know. What glorification is being made through the television! A brigand, a terrorist. Veerappan, has been glorified through the television. That is the fate of the country, that is the fate of technology in this country. About three years back, a lot of students, young, innocent, children, fractured their legs, died, because of Shaktiman. How young innocent minds were taken away from the real facts! That caused a lot of misery and many lost their lives. Mr. Duraisamy wanted the 'F' channel to be introduced after 10 p.m. Why? Because...*(Interruptions)*. Sir, I may be given two minutes more. I am not

referring to him. The technology is for the promotion of cultural heritage, development and improvement of knowledge. But which way is it going? Similarly, what is the authority to whom the proposed amendment is going to give the power? The authority which is going to prohibit any cable TV would be the Deputy Commissioner, Sub-Divisional Magistrate and the Commissioner of Police; like that. All right. In the meantime, they should not become the dictating officers also. We must take precautions.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ADHIK SHIRODKAR): Please conclude now.

SHRI H.K. JAVARE GOWDA: Under these circumstances, in preventing the abuse of technological development, this proposed amendment will help. So, I welcome this Bill. Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ADHIK SHIRODKAR): Please remember, we have allotted only one hour. We have more than 15 speakers. Only seven speakers have spoken and hardly 20 minutes are left, with the reply of the Minister to be made. So, the time given is very short. Kindly conform to it.

SHRI MANOJ BHATTACHARYA (West Bengal) : Sir, I have a submission to make. It is a very important Bill. It concerns our national life.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ADHIK SHIRODKAR): For all Bills, whether important or unimportant, time is given by the appropriate Committee, the Business Advisory Committee. That decides the time over which I have no control. Now, Shri V.V. Raghavan. One minute.

SHRI V.V. RAGHAVAN (Kerala): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the cable television network is a very powerful instrument to influence the minds of the people. And it is being influenced nowadays. I know that the hon. Minister is a very busy man. Even then, I request him to spare a few minutes to see the English films shown by the foreign cable networks. The sexual act is shown in all its vulgarity. It may be right for the western culture. But, we, in India, do not like to see it on the home screen. Please do something to censor all these dirty films which are rejected by the West and dumped in India.

Another thing I want to say is this. Very important personalities are invited to the studios and very serious topics are discussed. The VIPs or the VVIPs are sitting there. In between comes the Coco-Cola advertisement and the automobile advertisement, every kind of advertisement. Every now and then, after a few minutes, the topics are dropped and the advertisements come up. It is a hurt to our honour.

We are very much ashamed. You see, very, very important personalities are sitting there, and in between, the advertisements are shown so many times. Why should you do that? *(Time Bell rings)* The fashion show, as I understand, is meant for dress fashion. Nowadays, especially the fashion shows, are shown with the beauty, the size and all the organs of the female on the screen. That is the fashion. They come on the screen completely naked. How do you allow this in India? It may be right in Paris. But in India, these types of advertisements have to be banned. *(Interruptions)* We are being westernised. I was very much hurt when Shri Kuldip Nayyar was standing there for advertisement. *(Interruptions)*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ADHIK SHIRODKAR): If you refer to them, then you are losing your time. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI V.V. RAGHAVAN: I make one request to the Minister. Though he is burdened with so many other things, he should devote some time to get in order our culture, our outlook. Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ADHIK SHIRODKAR): Now, all the hon. members, whom I call upon to speak, have got one minutes each only, and I will strictly observe it.

SHRI PREM CHAND GUPTA (Bihar): Why should they be allowed one minute?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ADHIK SHIRODKAR): Kindly hear me. The Business Advisory Committee decides to allot the time. That time is divided into the speakers, as per the strength of the party, and I am helpless. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI PREM CHAND GUPTA: Sir, the House is supreme. *(Interruptions)*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ADHIK SHIRODKAR): That is why the Business Advisory Committee represents the House. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI PREM CHAND GUPTA: If this is the case, then don't discuss it. Just approve it. *(Interruptions)* Sir, this Bill is a very important Bill. *(Interruptions)*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ADHIK SHIRODKAR): When the Chair is standing, you will kindly sit down. The Business Advisory Committee represents the House. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI PREM CHAND GUPTA: No, Sir. Who is the Committee? The whole House is concerned and the whole nation is concerned. *(Interruptions)* This is not the court's verdict that the BAC has decided to allot one minute for each person. *(Interruptions)* The House is supreme.

श्री एस० एस० अहलुवालिया : बिजनेस ऐडवाइजरी कमेटी में जो डिस्मिशन होता है, चेयरमैन उसको 'अनाऊंस करता है । आप अपनी पार्टी के लीडर से पूछिए । बी०एस०सी० में हर पार्टी का लीडर बैठता है, फैसला करता है। आप अपनी पार्टी के लीडर से पूछिए ।
...(व्यवधान)...

श्रीमती सरोज दुबे (बिहार) : उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, अगर आप सदन की राय जानना चाहें तो हम कहते हैं कि हर सदस्य, हर पार्टी के लिए 5 मिनट रखे जाएं, हम एक मिनट में अपनी बात नहीं कह सकते, दो मिनट में भी अपनी बात नहीं कह सकते । एक मिनट तो गला साफ करने में चला जाता है ।
...(व्यवधान)...

SHRI PREM CHAND GUPTA: Let us not involve politics in this. It does not affect me It affects your sentiments also. *(Interruptions)*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ADHIK SHIRODKAR): I am repeating it again. After that, I will not hear any argument. We always allot a particular time, say one hour or one-and-a-half hour for discussion. Each party gets particular number of minutes. depending upon the strength of that party, and accordingly, the time is allotted. This is a time-honoured practice. It has nothing to do with the court to which Mr. Prem Chand Gupta made a reference. When I sit here, I am not a court or a lawyer. Please remember this.

SHRI PREM CHAND GUPTA: I am sorry. I did not explain myself properly. *(Interruptions)*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ADHIK SHIRODKAR): Shri N. Thalavai Sundaram. Mr. Sundaram, you have also got one minute.

SHRI N. THALAVAI SUNDARAM (Tamil Nadu): Sir, thank you very much for giving me this opportunity to speak on the Cable Television Networks (Regulation) Amendment Bill, 2000. Sir, so far as this Bill is concerned, I welcome it, and I also welcome the object of the Bill. I also welcome the amendment to the Bill to regularise the cable operators.

He is the Law Minister and our Vice-Chairman is a lawyer. I want only one clarification regarding this Bill. Every day, our political leaders are appearing on all the TV channels, Star TV plus other channels. As far as compulsory transmission of Doordarshan channels is concerned, unless and until all our political leaders support it--last week I met the Parliamentary Affairs Minister and the Law Minister on the Star channel--unless and until all our Ministers and all our political leaders encourage the Doordarshan, we will not be able to improve the Doordarshan programmes. I am not accusing either the Ministers or the political leaders. The other thing is this.

I know all the rules and regulations. I want one clarification from the Minister. As far as Section 8 Section 11, Section 18 and Section 19 are concerned, I welcome the Amendment Bill. During the election time all our political leaders interact with each other on all the channels. Some time ago, in 1996, one of the terrorists--I don't want to mention the name of the terrorist - canvassed for one particular political party during the election time. *...(Interruptions)...* If he wants, I will explain. The terrorist Veerappan canvassed for the DMK Party during the 1996 elections. *...(Interruptions)...* Yes, on Sun TV. *...(Interruptions)...* On Sun TV. *...(Interruptions)...* It was on Sun TV. Why should you object? *...(Interruptions)...*

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI (Tamil Nadu): Sir, he has become sick. There is no medicine for this. *...(Interruptions)...*

SHRI N. THALAVAI SUNDARAM: Why should you object? Why should you object? *...(Interruptions)...* Why should you object? Why

should you object? ...*(interruptions)*... I want a clarification. Why should you object?

SHRI R. MARGABANDU (Tamil Nadu): Sun TV is only for that purpose. ...*(interruptions)*...

SHRI V. P. DURAISAMY: Our Party is very, very strong. We are ready for elections next time. ...*(interruptions)*...

SHRI N. THALAVAI SUNDARAM: Why should you object? Veerappan canvassed for your party during 1996. Everybody knows that. ...*(interruptions)*... You know it very well ...*(interruptions)*... They know it very well ...*(interruptions)*...

SHRI R. MARGABANDU: You are not able to solve the Cauvery problem ...*(interruptions)*...

SHRI N. THALAVAI SUNDARAM: I have made a point. I want a clarification.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ADHIK SHIRODKAR) : Please don't repeat it. You have made your point. Have you finished it?

SHRI N. THALAVAI SUNDARAM: No, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ADHIK SHIRODKAR): Have you finished? Otherwise, go to your next point, please.

SHRI N. THALAVAI SUNDARAM: Sir, this is a very valid point. I am asking the Minister....*(interruptions)*.....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ADHIK SHIRODKAR): You have made your point. Please go to the next point, if you have any. ...*(interruptions)*...

SHRI N. THALAVAI SUNDARAM: Sir, you know very well.....*(interruptions)*... Mr. Virumbi, you are not the Minister. ...*(interruptions)*...

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI: Sir, Veerappan was paid by one

political party. ...*(interruptions)*... If they go through the record, they will find out that they have given money to Veerappan.

SHRI N. THALAVAI SUNDARAM: You are not the Minister. ...*(interruptions)*... it was telecast on Sun TV. ...*(interruptions)*...

SHRI V.P. DURAISAMY: You are doing the same thing, canvassing through your channel. ...*(interruptions)*... How have you fought the elections? ...*(interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ADHIK SHIRODKAR): Please sit down. ...*(interruptions)*... Sit down. ...*(interruptions)*... Mr. Sundaram, please sit down.

SHRI N. THALAVAI SUNDARAM: Sir, another point is.....*(interruptions)*... Mr. Virumbi, you are not the Minister. ...*(interruptions)*...

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, their party has given money to Veerappan. This is very clear. There is a statement given in the Press. ...*(interruptions)*... This cannot be refuted by them. ...*(interruptions)*...

SHRI V.P. DURAISAMY: Sir, it should not go on record. ...*(interruptions)*...

SHRI N. THALAVAI SUNDARAM: Let the Minister reply. ...*(interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ADHIK SHIRODKAR) : Please sit down. Please sit down. ...*(interruptions)*... Our Deputy Chairperson has repeatedly made a point, "Whenever both the Parties get up, I will request the Parliamentary Affairs Minister to keep one session only for these two Groups till they come to an understanding!"

SHRI N. THALAVAI SUNDARAM: What is this, Sir? Sometimes, Congress and BJP also fight.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ADHIK SHIRODKAR) : Please, you have finished.

SHRI N. THALAVAI SUNDARAM: No, no; it is a valid point.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ADHIK SHIRODKAR): No; please don't repeat. Make your point on this Bill.

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI: Sir, this is happening because unrelated matters are being discussed in the House. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI N. THALAVAI SUNDARAM: Mr. Minister, I want another clarification as far as this matter is concerned. It is only in Tamil Nadu and Chennai that certain monopolies are there. I do not mention the Bombay name. As far as Tamil Nadu is concerned, I mention the particular name in Tamil Nadu. There is one Sumangali Network; they are operating only for those who are attached with the same political party. Take, for example, the Sumangali Network. They never operated through any private operator. Mr. Minister, please listen to my question. *(Interruptions)*... This is a valid question. As far as cable network is concerned, in Chennai there is one cable network, the Sumangali Cable Network. It is the sister concern of a major private channel. I don't want to mention the name of that channel. If I mention the name, they will shout at me. *(Interruptions)*....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ADHIK SHIRODKAR): Mr. Sundaram, please conclude. *(Interruptions)*....

SHRI N. THALAVAI SUNDARAM: I want a clarification from the Minister. *(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ADHIK SHIRODKAR): Please take your seat. *(Interruptions)*... Please take your seat. *(Interruptions)*...

SHRI N. THALAVAI SUNDARAM: No. *(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ADHIK SHIRODKAR): You will have to. *(Interruptions)*... Please speak on the Bill. *(Interruptions)*....

SHRI N. THALAVAI SUNDARAM: Yes, I am speaking on the Bill. *(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ADHIK SHIRODKAR): But you are going on speaking about something else. There is some rule. Please don't do it. *(Interruptions)*....

SHRI V.P. DURAISAMY: He is bringing in irrelevant things. *(Interruptions)*....

SHRI N. THALAVAI SUNDARAM: I am speaking on the Bill. *(Interruptions)*... If you are not going to allow me, I am going to walk out. *(Interruptions)*... What is this? This is connected with the Bill. *(Interruptions)*... Some political party is running a private channel. *(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ADHIK SHIRODKAR): Kindly remember, your time is over. You have taken five minutes instead of one minute. *(Interruptions)*...

SHRI N. THALAVAI SUNDARAM: If you are not going to allow me, I am going to walk out. *(Interruptions)*....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ADHIK SHIRODKAR): Please don't threaten the Chair. *(Interruptions)*...

SHRI N. THALAVAI SUNDARAM: I am not threatening you. *(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ADHIK SHIRODKAR): You have threatened the Chair. *(Interruptions)*...

SHRI N. THALAVAI SUNDARAM: You are threatening me. I am only asking the Minister. *(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ADHIK SHIRODKAR): Nobody can stop you. Please don't do it. Please don't provoke the other party. Kindly speak about the amendment. *(Interruptions)*... Kindly speak about the amendment and don't threaten the Chair ever again. *(Interruptions)*....

SHRI N. THALAVAI SUNDARAM: Sir,...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ADHIK SHIRODKAR): No. You please conclude.

SHRI N. THALAVA SUNDARAM: I conclude, Sir. Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ADHIK SHIRODKAR): Thank you. Before I call upon the next Member to speak, there are some messages from the Lok Sabha. Mr. Secretary-General.

MESSAGES FROM THE LOK SABHA

The Appropriation (No.3) Bill, 2000.

The Appropriation (No.4) Bill, 2000.

SECRETARY-GENERAL: Sir, I have to report to the House the following messages received from the Lok Sabha, signed by the Secretary-General of the Lok Sabha:-

(I)

"In accordance with the provisions of rule 96 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to enclose the Appropriation (No.3) Bill, 2000, as passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 21st August, 2000."

"The Speaker has certified that this Bill is a Money Bill within the meaning of article 110 of the Constitution of India."

(II)

"In accordance with the provisions of rule 96 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to enclose the Appropriation (No.4) Bill, 2000, as passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 21st August, 2000."

"The Speaker has certified that this Bill is a Money Bill within the meaning of article 110 of the Constitution of India."